DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 226 780 JC 830 073

TITLE	Implementation of Budget Act Language to Reduce State Apportionments to Community College Districts by $30 Million: A Report to the Legislature in Response to the 1982-83 Budget Act.
INSTITUTION	California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento.
REPORT NO	CPEC-82-32
PUB DATE	Sep 82
NOTE	50p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Budgeting; *Community Colleges; Community Services; Educational Finance; Financial Problems; *Financial Support; Noncredit Courses; Recreational Programs; *Resource Allocation; *Retrenchment; *State Aid; State Legislation; *Statewide Planning; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

This report reviews actions taken by the Board of Governors and the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges to implement the 1982-83 Budget Act's $30 million reduction in state apportionments for the community colleges. First, background material specifies the options provided by the legislature to effect the savings, including cutting funding for non-credit courses; avocational, recreational, and personal development courses; or certain types of adult and community education courses. Next, actions of the Board of Governors and the Chancellor's Office to implement the funding reduction are discussed, including the identification of avocational, recreational, and personal development courses that could be offered as self-supporting community service classes. Then, the report outlines procedures used to calculate reductions based on district reports and estimated apportionment reductions on a district-by-district basis. After the criteria for courses to be deleted are presented, an analysis of the effect of the funding reduction on the community colleges' mission is provided. Finally, findings regarding the implementation of the budget reduction are outlined. Appendices include a report to the legislature on the deletion of selected credit and noncredit courses from the community college curriculum and tentative lists of courses to be deleted. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED226780

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Testa

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

The California Postsecondary Education Commission was created by the Legislature and the Governor in 1974 as the successor to the California Coordinating Council for Higher Education in order to coordinate and plan for education in California beyond high school. As a state agency, the Commission is responsible for assuring that the State's resources for postsecondary education are utilized effectively and efficiently; for promoting diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to the needs of students and society; and for advising the Legislature and the Governor on statewide educational policy and funding.

The Commission consists of 15 members. Nine represent the general public, with three each appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Governor. The other six represent the major educational systems of the State.

The Commission holds regular public meetings throughout the year at which it takes action on staff studies and adopts positions on legislative proposals affecting postsecondary education. Further information about the Commission, its meetings, its staff, and its other publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814; telephone (916) 445-7933.

IMPLEMENTATION OF BUDGET ACT LANGUAGE TO REDUCE STATE APPORTIONMENTS TO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS BY $30 MILLION

A Report to the Legislature
in Response to the 1982-83 Budget Act

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814

Commission Report 82-32

September 1982

CONTENTS

	Page
BACKGROUND	1
ACTIONS OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS AND THE CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE	2
PROCEDURES FOR CALCULATING REDUCTIONS	3
CRITERIA FOR COURSES TO BE DELETED	4
DELETION OF REAL ESTATE COURSES	6
EFFECT ON THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE'S MISSION	9
CONCLUSION	12
APPENDIX A: Report to the Legislature: The Deletion of Selected Credit and Noncredit Courses From The California Community College Curriculum	15
APPENDIX B: List of Courses to be Deleted from the Credit and Noncredit Program	51
REFERENCES	53

IMPLEMENTATION OF BUDGET ACT LANGUAGE TO REDUCE STATE APPORTIONMENTS TO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS BY $30 MILLION

BACKGROUND

In response to language in the 1982-83 Budget Act, this report comments on actions taken by the Board of Governors and the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges to implement the Budget Act's $30 million reduction in State apportionments for Community Colleges in 1982-83.

This reduction was based on Commission recommendations contained in Student Charges, Student Financial Aid, and Access to Postsecondary Education, which the Commission prepared in response to Assembly Concurrent Resolution 81 (Hart, 1982). In its report, the Commission recommended that, in order to avoid establishing a permanent statewide Community College fee for 1982-83, the Community Colleges should restructure the funding of certain elements of their curricula. Specifically, the Commission sought greater uniformity among Community College districts in the levels of public subsidy and student fees for avocational, recreational, and personal development courses. In addition, the Commission encouraged the Legislature to grant authority to the Board of Governors to establish explicit State funding priorities within Community College course offerings.

Acting on these Commission recommendations, in the 1982-83 Budget Act the Legislature directed that:

> The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall develop policies and guidelines from the options identified below to reduce state apportionments to community college districts by at least $30 million in 1982-83:
>
> a. Identify those noncredit courses ineligible for state apportionments under Sections 84640.5 and 84641 of the Education Code;
>
> b. Identify those avocational, recreational, and personal development courses, whether offered for credit or noncredit, that are offered more appropriately as community service classes and should not receive state apportionments; or
>
> c. Identify those adult and community education courses, whether offered for credit or noncredit, which will

receive state apportionments at a lower rate of subsidy per ADA.

On the basis of these policies and guidelines, the chancellor's office shall, for computational purposes, estimate the number of 1981-82 credit and noncredit ADA affected. For the purposes of Education Code Section 84620, the chancellor's office shall subtract this amount of ADA and base revenues associated with that ADA, before performing the computations specified in Education Code Sections 84605 through 84609. Such reductions shall total at least $30 million in state apportionments and shall not, under any circumstances, be based on a proportionate reduction of apportionments to all community college districts.

The chancellor shall consult with CPEC during the development and prior to the implementation of the provisions of this section. The chancellor shall report to the Legislature by August 15, 1982 on implementation of this section.

In addition, CPEC shall submit a report to the Legislature on the implementation of this section by no later than September 15, 1982. (Chapter 321, Statutes of 1982).

ACTIONS OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS AND THE CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE

In implementing the required reductions, the Board of Governors and the Chancellor's Office chose to utilize the second of the three options presented by the Legislature. The criteria and procedures that it utilized in identifying the avocational, recreational, and personal development courses that should be offered as community service classes are described in detail in the Chancellor's Office publication, The Deletion of Selected Credit and Noncredit Courses From The Curriculum, which is attached as Appendix A. The Board-approved list of courses to be moved from State support to a community services basis is included as Appendix B. While the title of the report to the Legislature implies that the avocational, recreational, and personal development courses identified by the Board of Governors may no longer be offered by colleges, these courses may still be offered by colleges in the community services area on a fee-support basis.

Despite the short time available to the Board to reach its decision, both the Board and Chancellor's Office made a substantial effort to

involve Community College personnel in the development of the course deletion list. Due to the initial lack of 1981-82 course data, the Board's action was necessarily inexact in terms of expected apportionment reductions. Preliminary estimates from district reports indicate, however, that the resulting course list will secure the necessary $30 million reduction through the elimination of State support for these avocational, recreational, and personal development courses.

Both politically and administratively, the task given to the Board of Governors was difficult and largely thankless. Whether or not one agrees with each element of the Board's actions, the Board, the Chancellor's Office, and the Community Colleges deserve recognition for acting promptly and responsibly in meeting the legislative mandate for the $30 million reduction. Yet, in many ways the Board's action must be seen as only the necessary first step in the difficult process of clearly defining State priorities for funding instruction at the Community Colleges. The Legislature's action was more than a one-time mandate caused by a severe State budget crisis. It reflected long-held legislative concerns about the proper role, mission, function, and funding of the California Community Colleges. While the $30 million amount was dictated by fiscal exigency, the mandate was designed specifically to produce greater long-run uniformity and clearer priorities in State support for Community College offerings. Significantly, the Legislature categorically rejected the notion of an across-the-board budget cut to reach the $30 million target reduction.

At the same time, the elements of the Board's response should not be viewed as providing a long-term solution to legislative concerns. Mention has been made already of the difficulties in terms of time and data which confronted the Board. Moreover, the Board is currently undertaking several long-range planning activities that should provide a more comprehensive basis for establishing policies on Community College mission, State funding priorities, and student fees. These activities include the development of both a contingency plan for establishing student fees (as recommended in the Commission's ACR 81 report) and a long-range finance plan to restructure State support for the Community Colleges. The Board's recent actions on the $30 million budget reduction eventually should be reviewed in light of long-term recommendations for changes in policy and financing mechanisms likely to stem from these important projects.

PROCEDURES FOR CALCULATING REDUCTIONS

After Board action on the list of courses to be deleted from State support, the Chancellor's Office requested all districts to report the amount of average daily attendance (ADA) generated in such courses during the 1981-82 fiscal year. It then used these reports to make

the estimated apportionment reductions on a district-by-district basis that are indicated in the Chancellor's Office report in Appendix A. As a percentage of total district revenues, these estimated reductions range from 0.59 to 6.03 percent. Statewide, they total $29.2 million, or 2.04 percent of the Community Colleges' total revenue. Currently these reported figures are being reviewed by the Chancellor's Office staff in light of detailed 1980-81 course information developed by the Course Classification System. The Chancellor's Office staff indicates that this resolution process should result in reductions reaching the mandated $30 million figure.

In apportioning the reductions, the Chancellor's Office will remove the identified number of ADA for each district from the district's base revenues using its marginal (two-thirds) cost rate rather than its average cost rate. The Chancellor's Office staff chose the marginal rate for at least three reasons: First, it lessens the fiscal impact of the reductions for those district which have relatively few avocational, recreational, or personal development courses offered for State support. Second, it requires that a larger number of ADA be identified statewide to reach the $30 million target, and thus meets the legislative mandate for the establishment of State-level priorities more completely. Third and finally, in view of the previous lack of explicitly-stated State funding priorities and the fact that all of the designated courses were eligible for 1981-82 funding, it appears to be the most equitable measure with which to make the base revenue reductions.

Should the $30 million figure not be reached as the ADA reductions are completed by this method, the Chancellor's Office staff will either develop a secondary apportionment reduction mechanism or expand the list of courses to be removed from State support. As noted above, such actions are not likely to be required, but at the July Board of Governors meeting several Board members argued against the secondary reduction strategy. They stated that because the Legislature had given the Board responsibility for making the $30 million reduction, the Board should expand the list of courses to reach the required reduction based on statewide priorities rather than having individual districts identify courses without Statewide direction.

CRITERIA FOR COURSES TO BE DELETED

The Chancellor's Office staff developed the following six criteria for identifying the courses to be moved to the community services area:

a. Courses which fall within the meaning of the proposed language of the budget bill which expresses legislative

intent. That language refers to "avocational, recreational, and personal development" courses.

b. Courses which do not appear to assist the community colleges in fulfilling their mission described as follows in the Master Plan for Higher Education:

Education Code 66701. Public community colleges shall offer instruction through but not beyond the second year of college. These institutions may grant the associate in arts and the associate in science degree. Their program may include but shall not be limited to: standard collegiate courses for transfer to other institutions; vocational and technical fields leading to employment; general or liberal arts courses; and community services. (Enacted by Stats. 1976, Ch. 1010.)

c. Courses in which students enroll for significantly greater private than public interest and also which appear to have been designed to serve private rather than public interest.

This criterion attempts to distinguish those course offerings which students pursue for purposes of achieving an educational objective such as a degree or certificate from those offerings which attract a large number of casual students, part-time or otherwise, enrolled for the purpose of recreation or self-interest.

d. Self-help, avocational, and recreational courses which are not a required component of an academic or vocational program which has been approved by the Chancellor's Office in accordance with the provisions of Title 5, Sections 55000 and 55130.

e. Courses the deletion of which will not inhibit a college's response to the needs of local business and industry.

This criterion has been included to ensure and safeguard the maintenance of merging curricula which are expressly designed to meet the needs of business and industry, respond to plant closures, and significantly aid in the reduction of unemployment.

f. Courses in which students, other than regular students, might enroll for self-help, avocational, or recreational purposes and which should be offered on a fee basis. (Board of Governors, 1982, pages 4-5).

In general, these criteria served to implement the intent of the legislatively mandated $30 million reduction. They were not sufficiently specific, however, to be useful without a great deal of further clarification and interpretation. Thus the Chancellor's Office staff was forced to review individual course descriptions in developing the course list for deletion from State funding. These decisions were based on staff judgments as to the "avocational, recreational, or personal development" nature of the course as well as its relative priority for State funding.

Clearly such determinations are complex. Given the short time in which the Board of Governors was required to act, it was impossible for the Chancellor's staff to review all Community College course offerings and evaluate each course in light of the prescribed criteria. Because of this fact, this year's reductions should be viewed as a first step to more long-range program priorities. There is still a need, as noted in the Commission's report on the Implementation of the California Community Colleges Course Classification System, for the Board of Governors to develop more explicit policies as to "the purposes, scope, and support of community service classes" and to develop more explicit State-level priorities for community college funding. (California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1982a, pp. 18, 22).

The Chancellor's Office report notes the difficulty of determining which courses are avocational, recreational, or personal development in nature. Clearly students enroll in individual courses with a variety of educational objectives. Thus a course which serves a transfer function for one student may be purely avocational for another. The problems associated with assessing student objectives made it impossible to use such distinctions for this year's reductions. In its recommendation that the Board adopt a fee contingency plan, however, the Commission suggested that the Board consider differential fee policies based on student matriculation in a program of study or some other measure of student intent beyond course characteristics. For purposes of long-range planning and the establishment of State priorities and student charges, more explicit criteria will be needed.

DELETION OF REAL ESTATE COURSES

Perhaps the most controversial aspect of the Board of Governors' action has been the deletion from State support of "real estate courses except those courses designed to lead to the sales license". Typically, real estate courses in Community Colleges are of three types:

1. A "Real Estate Principles" course that prepares students to take the examination for a real estate sales license.

2. A designated block of six additional courses that are required for students wishing to secure a broker's license and are part of real estate associate degree and certificate programs.

3. Other real estate courses that are offered for continuing education or elective credit purposes.

Under the Board's action, only the first course will be eligible for continued State support. It is estimated that the reductions in State support for the other two types of courses will constitute between $3 million and $4 million of the required $30 million.

The reason for deleting real estate courses beyond the entry level course is described by the Chancellor's Office as follows:

> The rationale for including real estate courses on the deletion list was that the community colleges traditionally prepare students for entry level occupations. The entry level in the case of real estate is the sales license. Normally, the course entitled "Real Estate Principles" is the course taken in preparation for writing the examination for the sales license. After obtaining the sales license and entering the field of real estate, some persons seek additional courses to prepare for the broker's license. Since the persons who enroll in those additional courses are usually employed in their field, and since the purpose for taking such courses are upgrading, income enhancement, and personal and professional development, it was felt that such courses should be offered on a fee basis. Although similar arguments could be advanced for the inclusion on the deletion list of courses in law enforcement and fire science, it was felt that because such courses normally do not involve a two-tiered licensing process and they enhance the public safety they should be accorded a higher priority for State funding. (Program Evaluation and Approval Unit, 1982, page 15).

Real estate proponents argue that most real estate courses are clearly occupational in nature and are required or elective parts of approved degree programs within the Community College curriculum. As such, they contend, the courses should be exempt from the legislative mandate to designate "avocational, recreational, and personal development" courses for reduction.

The rationale cited in the Chancellor's Office report clearly extends to occupations other than law enforcement and fire science -- among them, accounting, secretarial services, banking and finance, and hotel management -- where the curriculum is structured for career advancement or professional development as well as entry into the field. A more comprehensive examination is needed of the distinction

between entry-level and career-advancement courses for funding and student fee purposes beyond this year. If policies on State subsidies or student fees are to be based on such career-level distinctions, they should be generally applicable. The Board's fee contingency plan and long-range finance plan should examine this issue for the curriculum as a whole rather than for real estate as a single subject area.

In the meantime, action is needed to assure that students enrolled in real estate degree programs receive academic credit for the courses moved to a fee-support basis. Real estate is the only degree program which has been moved wholesale to the community services area. In terms of equity to students currently enrolled in it, academic credit should be available for those students pursuing degree objectives. The Chancellor's Office has indicated its support for special legislation of this kind.

The Commission endorses this approach rather than an alternative of legislative intervention to reinstate the real estate courses to the credit program. Not only would that action reduce the $30 million budget reduction by $3 to 4 million--thereby requiring the Board of Governors to identify additional course deletions to compensate for real estate program, it would have several further repercussions:

- In terms of timing, it would mean mid-year restructuring of real-estate courses from community service classes to credit classes and from fee support to State support. Colleges have planned their fall schedules and fee policies in compliance with the Board of Governors decision. Mid-year corrections would require record-keeping conversions and fee refunds to students currently enrolled.

- In terms of authority, the legislative mandate to the Board of Governors to implement the $30 million reduction required the Board to establish explicit State priorities for funding. Although individuals and special interest groups may disagree with specific elements of the course list developed by the Board, the Board clearly was acting within its legislative authorization. During its discussions on the course list, the Board was closely divided on the real estate issue and discussed other courses and program areas for inclusion in the list. Despite time constraints, the Board made a thoughtful and responsible decision. Legislative reversal would weaken the Board's responsibility for planning and leadership within the system.

- Finally, in terms of politics, such action would encourage other groups, such as instructors in home economics, physical education, and fine arts, to seek additional legislative exemption from the course list. The Board of Governors should remain the proper body for making statewide program priority decisions.

EFFECT ON THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE'S MISSION

The Chancellor's Office has been somewhat ambigious in its assessment of the impact of the $30 million reduction on the mission and function of the Community Colleges. In the agenda item presented to the Board of Governors at their July meeting, the staff assessed the impact of the budget language reduction in the following terms:

> There is no clear mandate in the 1982-83 budget language to decrease services or to eliminate certain individuals from eligibility for services. The mandate speaks essentially to an identification of those avocational, recreational, and personal development courses that are offered more appropriately as community services courses and that should not receive state apportionments. The remediation mission of the community colleges is left intact. The removal of courses from the credit area which should be more appropriately offered as community services classes strengthens the general, transfer and occupational functions of the community colleges by ensuring that only courses at the collegiate level are offered for credit. (Board of Governors, 1982, page 7).

Nonetheless, the Chancellor's Office report reproduced in Appendix A presents a far more gloomy picture of the impact of the Board's action on Community College mission:

> One of the major distinguishing features of the California Community Colleges has been the flexibility and rapidity with which they could provide tuition-free education to meet emerging local needs, especially to educationally and financially disadvantaged students. In some measure, that flexibility has been reduced by the imposition of the list of courses to be deleted from the credit and noncredit programs. While it is true that many of the deleted courses may be offered as fee-based community services classes, access to those classes will be reduced because many persons will be unwilling or unable to pay the required fee. Unfortunately, the transfer of courses from state support to user fee will most likely bear most heavily on those least able to pay. Thus, although the range of offerings of the Colleges should remain substantially the same, in terms of the traditional flexibility of response to local needs, and in terms of access to free public education for educationally and economically disadvantaged students, the mission of the Community College will have been affected. (Program Evaluation and Approval Unit, 1982, page 16).

Several assertions in this latter statement should not go unchallenged. First, it is doubtful that the elimination of avocational photography, pet care, conversational foreign language for travellers, private pilot's ground school, sailing, and disco dance "will most likely bear most heavily on those least able to pay." The Chancellor's office report provides no empirical evidence to support this claim. Second, the hallmark of the Community College mission may be the rapidity with which they can provide "tuition free education to meet emerging local needs", the nature of such needs should be examined in the light of statewide priorities.

Also warranting scrutiny is the assertion in the Chancellor's Office report that the Community College transfer program has been damaged (p. 14):

> Because no sure measure of student intent could be included in the preparation of the deleted course list, and since transferability proved to be an unsound criterion, and since the marginal courses alone would not have produced the required savings, it was necessary to include on the list a large number of courses which have traditionally been offered in colleges and universities, which transfer to the four-year colleges, and which are offered by universities in the other segments of public higher education in California. An anomalous situation has been created in which some courses which can no longer be offered for credit for apportionment in the Community Colleges continue to be offered at public expense for credit in the University of California and the California State Universities.

Certainly it is true that many of the courses appearing on the reclassification list can be used for transfer to four-year institutions, but the assumption that the Community Colleges are being mistreated because some of these courses continue to be publicly supported at other public institutions is overly simplistic for several reasons:

- First, many of the courses identified by the Board of Governors are offered by the University of California and the California State University through their extension division on a fully fee-supported basis.

- Second, students enrolled in State supported credit courses in the other public segments are fully matriculated and pay significant fees to enroll each year.

- Third, even with the reductions imposed by the Board's action, the level of student activity in such courses represents a far greater proportion of the instructional activity in the Community Colleges than in either of the other public segments.

- Finally, the financing mechanisms for the Community Colleges, which are based on student contact hours rather than units of academic credit, provide a far greater proportionate level of support for physical education and fine arts workshop courses than at the other public segments. For example, a one-unit physical education course meeting three hours per week would represent only one-fifteenth of a full-time equivalent (FTE) undergraduate student load at the University or the State University, based upon a 15-unit load per full-time equivalent (FTE) student. The same course would generate one-fifth of an average daily attendance (ADA) at the Community College, however, because the three weekly class hours represent a larger proportion of a student's load based upon student contact hours.

Clearly the list of specific physical education and fine arts courses identified by the Board of Governors is somewhat arbitrary and represents negotiations with practitioners in these areas. One could question why badminton was included while racquetball, bowling, and golf were not. Nonetheless, the point of the Commission's ACR 81 recommendation and subsequent legislaton was not directed to the transferability of specific courses to four-year institutions but rather to the differential proportion of State-supported Community College instruction to be found among districts in such avocational, recreational, and personal development courses and to the large proportion of these courses statewide. As the Commission noted in its ACR 81 report (pp. 23-24):

> . . . in many districts, personal development, recreational, and avocational courses such as jogging, surfing, jazzercise, needlepoint, and ballroom dancing, are offered for credit at the average credit rate of $1,930 per ADA with no user fees. In other districts, these same subjects are offered as noncredit courses at the $1,100 per ADA noncredit rate with no fees. In still other districts, such subjects are offered as community service classes and charge student fees. Given limited resources, such funding and student charges inequities cannot be permitted to continue. Furthermore, physical education courses currently comprise nearly 9 percent of the statewide Community College total credit workload and fine and applied arts courses comprise an additional 10 percent. In effect, approximately one out of every five credit ADA funded by the State in 1981-82 stemmed from enrollment in either physical education or fine and applied arts courses. While these disciplines are part of any well-balanced liberal arts curriculum, the majority of students enrolled in such courses are enrolled for only one or two courses per term and are not taking the courses as part of any certificate or degree program.

The Commission believes that the heavy concentration of student enrollment and resulting State apportionment payments in recreational and avocational courses which yield primarily personal benefits represents a serious imbalance in the use of limited State resources for undergraduate instruction. Moreover, the Commission believes that a significant portion of the current course activity in these areas could be offered more appropriately as community services classes on a fee-support basis.

There may be alternative mechanisms other than identifying specific course titles to deal with this issue (such as a move to FTE funding or some control of the relative proportion of State-funded instruction in these areas). Yet, there is no evidence that the $30 million reduction actions taken by the Board of Governors has harmed the transfer function of the colleges seriously.

CONCLUSION

The course reclassification actions by the Board of Governors and the Chancellor's Office have dealt forthrightly with the concerns expressed by the Commission in its ACR 81 report and by legislators during budget deliberations. As such, they represent a positive and productive first step in the process of delineating more clearly State-level priorities for funding.

The following points summarize Commission findings with respect to the implementation of the $30 million budget reduction in the California Community Colleges:

- In general, the criteria developed by the Chancellor's Office and the Board of Governors comply with the legislative mandate to identify avocational, recreational, and personal development courses to be moved to community services. The criteria should be reviewed, however, in light of other long-range planning efforts currently underway.

- Despite the title of the Chancellor's Office report to the Legislature on Deletion of Selected Credit and Noncredit Courses From the Curriculum, the Commission did not recommend, nor the Legislature mandate deletion of the identified courses from the curriculum. Rather, the recommendation and mandate were to move such courses from State-support to a fee-support basis in the community services area.

- The use of the marginal rate to make reductions in district base revenues was not specified in budget act language. Its use serves, however, to implement the policy objectives of the budget

reduction and is consistent with legislative direction giving the Chancellor some flexibility in implementing the required budget reductions.

- The rationale for including the real estate program within the course reclassification action should be reviewed with respect to its applicability to other occupational programs within the context of the Board's development of fee contingency and finance plans. In the meantime, however, temporary legislative action needs to be taken to allow students enrolled in real estate degree programs to receive academic credit for real estate courses required for their degrees.

- There is no evidence to support the contention that the movement of the identified avocational, recreational and personal development courses to the community services area will bear most heavily on economically disadvantaged students.

- Even with the course reclassifications, the relative proportion of State-supported instructional workload in physical education and fine arts disciplines remains greater at the Community Colleges than at the other public segments. This fact, as well as segmental differences in financing mechanisms for such courses should be considered when evaluating the Chancellor's Office assertion that Community Colleges are being treated unfairly with respect to such "transfer" courses.

- The Board of Governors should continue to be the body responsible for implementing specific State-level program priorities within the California Community Colleges.

The Board's and Chancellor's Office actions certainly are not the final word on Community College mission, function, and priorities. As one Board member stated during the Board's deliberations, the legislative mandate for the $30 million reduction in Community College instructional offerings necessitated some arbitrary short-term judgments about relative State priorities without the benefit of more comprehensive discussion of long-term Community College missions and functions. Such discussions should be reflected in the Board's proposals later this fiscal year regarding the fee contingency plan and long-range finance program.

APPENDIX A

REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE: THE DELETION OF SELECTED CREDIT AND NONCREDIT COURSES FROM THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE CURRICULUM

Program Evaluation and Approval Unit
California Community Colleges
August 16, 1982

California Community Colleges

DELETION OF SELECTED CREDIT AND NONCREDIT COURSES FROM THE CURRICULUM

BOARD OF GOVERNORS
CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Program Evaluation
and Approval Unit

August 1982

REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE:
THE DELETION OF SELECTED CREDIT AND NONCREDIT COURSES FROM THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE CURRICULUM

This report was prepared by the
Program Evaluation and Approval Unit;
Administrator, Allan L. Petersen

Dr. Ernest Berg was primarily
responsible for writing the report,
with assistance from Dr. John Meyer
and Charlie Klein

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
August 16, 1982

REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE: THE DELETION OF SELECTED CREDIT AND NONCREDIT COURSES FROM THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE CURRICULUM

Introduction

California Community Colleges were required by the Legislature to reduce their budgets by a total of $30 million in FY 1982-83 through lessening or removing state support for courses of lower public priority. Because of this Legislative mandate, the Board of Governors, for the first time in history, directed the 70 California community college districts to stop offering certain subjects as credit or state-supported noncredit courses. Districts had the option of moving such courses to the fee-supported community services category.

The Board's action may be seen in the context of other recent changes at the state and local levels to tighten community college academic standards. In the past three years, statewide grading policies, definitions of credit and noncredit courses, and general education requirements for the Associate degree have all been made more rigorous. Many colleges have independently reviewed their programs and a number of marginal courses have been dropped.

The deletion of courses from the credit and noncredit program in July 1982, however, dwarfs such previous developments in its immediate impact on and its implications for community college students and the public. The events leading up to the Legislative mandate, the implementation of that mandate by the Board of Governors, and the effects on community colleges are the subjects of this report.

Background

The Course Classification System

AB 8 (Chapter 282, Statutes of 1979) required the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges to conduct a study and prepare policy recommendations on the determination of credit and noncredit courses. A broadly based advisory committee was established for that purpose and a final report was published in July 1980 ("Credit and Noncredit Courses in the California Community Colleges: A Report to the Legislature"). The two major accomplishments of the advisory committee were to clarify the definitions of credit and noncredit courses, and to establish a classification system for all courses offered by community colleges.

The course classification system proposed in the Credit and Noncredit report was adopted in principle by the Board of Governors when the report was issued. In November 1981, it was formally incorporated into regulations, with slight modifications, as Section 55001 of Title 5 of the California Administrative Code. The system is shown in Appendix A.

In 1981 the Legislature adopted AB 1626 and AB 1369 as the funding vehicles for the community colleges. AB 1369 amended Section 84603 of the Education Code to reflect the following mandate:

> *84603. (a) The Legislature hereby finds and declares that the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges adopted in November 1980, a program classification system.*
> *(b) The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall collect data on all programs, courses, and classes offered by community college districts in the 1981-82 fiscal year in both credit and noncredit modes and the Board of Governors shall develop classification criteria which shall establish uniformity of classification of credit and noncredit modes among all districts by July 1, 1982.*
> *(c) The Chancellor of the California Community Colleges shall collect information on course offerings and activities for each community college district based on the program classification system adopted by the Board of Governors.*
> *(1) The Chancellor shall report this information to the California Postsecondary Education Commission and to the Legislature by March 1, 1982.*
> *(2) The California Postsecondary Education Commission shall review the information collected and advise the Legislature with regard to the accuracy and uniformity of the information by April 1, 1982. The commission shall assist the Chancellor in monitoring the collection of the information and determining the format for presentation.*

In October 1981, community colleges were asked to classify all credit and noncredit courses, and community services classes and activities according to the system in Appendix A. All community colleges responded, and more than 100,000 credit and noncredit courses and over 6,000 community services classes were included in the classification. The total workload amounted to almost 500,000,000 student contact hours.

The massive amount of data collected was analyzed by the staff of the Chancellor's Office and the required report was prepared and submitted to the Legislature in March 1982 ("Course Classification System: Report of Data Collection and Description of Offerings").

The report indicated that 52% of the total student contact hours were in courses classified as liberal arts and sciences for baccalaureate degrees and 35% of the total student contact hours were in occupational courses designed to provide students with job entry skills. Together those categories represented 87% of the instructional effort of the community colleges. The report also revealed that approximately 19% of the credit student contact hours were generated by courses in physical education and fine and applied arts. Some observers perceived this concentration as an imbalance in the community college curriculum.

Assembly Concurrent Resolution 81

In March of 1982 Assembly Concurrent Resolution 81 directed the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) to "conduct a study of the impact of student charges upon access to public postsecondary education." That study was submitted to the Governo[illegible] and the Legislature in April 1982. The CPEC response to ACR 81 noted that:

> *...physical education courses currently comprise nearly nine percent of the statewide Community College total credit workload and fine and applied arts courses comprise an additional ten percent. In effect, approximately one out of every five credit ADA funded by the State in 1981-82 stemmed from enrollment in either physical education or fine and applied arts courses.*

Also in response to ACR 81, the CPEC report included ten recommendations with intersegmental applicability. Recommendations five and six has direct bearing on community colleges. It reads as follows:

> *RECOMMENDATION 5. The State should establish explicit policies to assure a combination of State and student support of Community Colleges programs, that, to the extent possible, continue existing no-charge practices for students enrolled in courses and programs that have greatest State priority.*
>
> *5.1 To assure that only those programs or courses that have greatest State priority are subsidized by the State and to assure equitable support rates for similar courses in different districts, the Legislature should direct the Board of Governors to develop Title 5 regulations: (a) identifying noncredit courses eligible for State support; (b) applying a uniform support rate of $1,100 per ADA for all courses in adult basic education, high school diploma programs, English as a second language, citizenship, and community education; and (c) determining which avocational, recreational, and personal development courses should be offered as community services classes on a self-supported basis.*

RECOMMENDATION 6.1. State apportionments should be reduced by approximately $30 million to reflect expected savings from implementation of Recommendation 5.1.

The Chancellor's Office opposed these recommendations on the grounds that they would have to be implemented without adequate planning time and did not allow for consideration of the local district-by-district impact of change. If immediate short-term reductions were necessary in 1982-83, the Chancellor argued, "then the most realistic and educationally sound means must be to allow the Board of Governors and the Chancellor's Office the broadest discretion possible in considering options."

It is important to consider the context in which the CPEC recommendations were made. Essentially, the Commission recommended against the imposition of statewide, mandatory community college fees for fiscal year 1982-83, and as an alternative, recommended that prior to the imposition of such a fee legislative consideration should be given to the reduction of state support for courses deemed to be recreational, avocational or personal development in nature. (An additional recommendation that district reserves be reduced was not approved by the Legislature.)

A related CPEC recommendation called for the development by the Board of Governors of a contingency plan for the imposition of student fees if the state's economic situation does not significantly improve during the current fiscal year. The Board of Governors has already established a special committee board to develop such a contingency plan and will be prepared to report its recommendations by December of this year.

Legislative Action

The Legislature adopted a modified version of the CPEC recommendation related to courses in June 1982. The Budget Bill, AB 21, directed that:

The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall develop policies and guidelines from the options identified below to reduce state apportionments to community college districts by at least $30 million in 1982-83:

a. Identify those noncredit courses ineligible for state apportionments under Sections 84640.5 and 84641 of the Education Code;

b. Identify those avocational, recreational, and personal development courses, whether offered for credit or noncredit, that are offered more appropriately as community service classes and should not receive state apportionments; or

c. Identify those adult and community education courses, whether offered for credit or noncredit, which will receive state apportionments at a lower rate of subsidy per ADA.

On the basis of these policies and guidelines, the Chancellor's Office shall, for computational purposes, estimate the number of

1981-82 credit and noncredit ADA affected. For the purposes of Education Code Section 84620, the Chancellor's Office shall subtract this amount of ADA and base revenues associated with that ADA, before performing the computations specified in Education Code Sections 84605 through 84600. Such reductions shall total at least $30 million in state apportionments and shall not, under any circumstances, be based on a proportionate reduction of apportionments to all community college districts...

The Chancellor shall consult with CPEC during the development and prior to the implementation of the provisions of this section. The Chancellor shall report to the Legislature by August 15, 1982 on implementation of this section.

In addition, CPEC shall submit a report to the Legislature on the implementation of this section by no later than September 15, 1982.

Of the three options contained in the budget bill language, the Chancellor determined that the major effort would be directed at option (b), the identification of recreational, avocational, and personal development courses which could appropriately be offered as community services classes on a fee basis. Alternative (a) had, for the most part, already been accomplished as a result of the identification in AB 1626 and AB 1369 of the nine areas of state-supported noncredit courses. Colleges were instructed last year to remove all other noncredit courses from their noncredit programs or to offer them as community services classes.

Alternative (c), which required the Chancellor's Office to identify certain credit and noncredit courses which would be reimbursed for apportionment purposes at an unspecified lower rate, appeared to be infeasible since it could not be accomplished within the time limits mandated by the language of the budget bill. In addition, those districts which offer a significant noncredit program had already experienced severe financial losses as a result of the provisions of AB 1626 and AB 1369 which limited the types of noncredit courses to nine funded areas. The Chancellor believed that the required savings of $30 million could be accomplished through the implementation of option (b). The Chancellor's Office discussed this approach with the staff of the California Postsecondary Education Commission.

The timing by which the deletion of courses and the submission of the report to the Legislature was to be accomplished should be noted. The budget bill was signed on June 30. Implementing action was taken by the Board of Governors on July 16, 1982. The deletion of credit and noncredit courses imposed severe hardships upon the community colleges in terms of class schedule and staffing changes which were required to implement the deletion of courses. Summer sessions had already begun and many colleges had already published fall class schedules and had registered students in those classes. It was important for the Chancellor's Office to complete

the necessary reduction in ADA and apportionments so that colleges could be informed about their 1982-83 income levels, which would enable them to complete their planning for the fiscal year which began July 1, 1982. Notwithstanding the exigencies of the current fiscal crisis within the state, it should be stated that a course reduction of the kind mandated in the budget bill should have been allotted much more time for planning and implementation. The "emergency" plan for the deletion of credit and noncredit courses inevitably contained some inconsistencies, inadequacies, and inequities.

Preparation for Compliance with Mandates in Budget Bill

Establishing criteria

Several criteria were employed in determining which courses should be included on a preliminary list of courses that would be shifted to community services in order to achieve the required $30 million reduction. The criteria were in accord with the recent classification of courses implemented by the Chancellor's Office. Not all criteria are applicable to all of the courses identified by staff.

The criteria for the selection of courses to be deleted from the credit program were as follows:

a. Courses which fall within the meaning of the proposed language of the budget bill which expresses legislative intent. That language refers to "avocational, recreational, and personal development" courses.

b. Courses which do not appear to assist the community colleges in fulfilling their mission described as follows in the Master Plan for Higher Education:

> *Education Code 66701. Public community colleges shall offer instruction through but not beyond the second year of college. These institutions may grant the associate in arts and the associate in science degree. Their program may include but shall not be limited to: standard collegiate courses for transfer to other institutions; vocational and technical fields leading to employment; general or liberal arts courses; and community services. (Enacted by Stats. 1976, Ch. 1010.)*

c. Courses in which students enroll for significantly greater private than public interest and also which appear to have been designed to serve private rather than public interest.

This criterion attempts to distinguish those course offerings which students pursue for purposes of achieving an educational objective such as a degree or certificate from those offerings which attract a large number of casual students, part-time or otherwise, enrolled for the purpose of recreation or self-interest.

d. Self-help, avocational, and recreational courses which are not a required component of an academic or vocational program which has been approved by the Chancellor's Office in accordance with the provisions of Title 5, Sections 55000 and 55130.

e. Courses the deletion of which will not inhibit a college's response to the needs of local business and industry.

This criterion has been included to ensure and safeguard the maintenance of emerging curricula which are expressly designed to meet the needs of business and industry, respond to plant closures and significantly aid in the reduction of unemployment.

f. Courses in which students, other than regular students, might enroll for self-help, avocational, or recreational purposes and which should be offered on a fee basis.

Development of a list of courses to be deleted

Early in June members of the Chancellor's staff were directed to prepare a preliminary list of recreational, avocational, and self-help courses which are presently being offered by community colleges as credit or noncredit courses and which could more appropriately be offered as community services classes on a self-supporting basis on the basis of the criteria that have been stated. Staff reviewed and listed such offerings for twenty community colleges. The lists were refined into a number of categories of courses which were then included on the preliminary list of deletions. In the case of physical education and fine arts, it was found to be more efficient to list more specific course titles.

After the tentative list of courses to be deleted from the credit program was prepared by staff and a study of its effects on a stratified sample of thirteen colleges to be completed, it was discussed and reviewed with the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on two separate occasions. The Chancellor's Advisory Committee is comprised of represenatives of students, faculty, administrators and trustees. It is this committee which the Chancellor most heavily relies upon to represent the community college field. The list of courses was thoroughly discussed and reviewed by this committee.

In addition, the list was discussed at statewide meetings of the Chief Executive Officers (Chancellors, Superintendents and Presidents) of the local districts. It was also disseminated widely for field review to all chief instructional officers and statewide and local academic senate presidents. Representative groups of physical education division chairs and instructors, the Chief Instructional Officers Technical Advisory Committee, Fine Arts Division chairs and Home Economics division chairs and faculty also provided valuable assistance. There was not unanimity of opinion concerning the list of courses nor did staff attempt to achieve concensus on the various issues discussed with the

field. The meetings were extremely helpful in clarifying issues and misunderstandings and the list was modified and amended in several instances in response to suggestions from the field.

As staff collected sample data for 1981-82 on targeted courses, and compared them with the 1980-81 data on which the Course Classification Report, had been based, it gradually became evident that significant shifts from the credit program to community services had already occurred last year. Therefore, staff had to add more courses to the early versions of the list in an attempt to reach the required $30 million reduction.

Board of Governors Action

On June 25 a preliminary list of courses to be deleted from the credit and noncredit and noncredit programs was submitted to the Executive Committee of the Board of Governors along with explanatory material concerning the development of that list. A public hearing was held. The Executive Committee approved the list in principle and directed the Chancellor to continue its development and to submit it to the full Board at the next meeting. The preliminary list which was submitted to the Executive Committee is attached as Appendix B.

The final list of staff recommendations for courses to be deleted from the credit and noncredit programs of the community colleges is attached as Appendix C. That list was sent to the colleges in advance of approval by the Board of Governors to give colleges the maximum opportunity to prepare for the necessary deletions. The covering memorandum warned colleges of the possibility of revisions which might be made by the Board.

The staff's list was submitted to the Board of Governors at its regular meeting held in San Diego on July 16. Following discussion by the members of the Board, public testimony was heard for approximately two and one-half hours. Many persons and interest groups protested the inclusion on the list of courses from their specific areas. The Board then considered seriatim the recommended list of courses to be deleted. After lengthy discussion and by unanimous action the Board of Governors adopted the following list of courses:

LIST OF COURSES TO BE DELETED FROM THE CREDIT PROGRAM
(As approved by the Board of Governors, 7/16/82)

1. Single semester or single quarter conversational foreign language courses which have no prerequisite or which are designed for travelers.

2. Private Pilot's Ground School*.

3. Ham radio construction, operation, and licensure.

4. Self-help home sewing and needlecraft courses* except a single introductory course in clothing construction.

5. Self-help specialized cooking courses* except a single introductory course in cultural foods.

6. Self-help courses in home gardening; home livestock production; home and appliance repair and maintenance; antique and furniture repair, refinishing, and upholstering; and woodworking.

7. Self-help courses in pet selection, care and grooming.

8. Self-help courses in consumer maintenance of automobiles, motorcycles, bicycles, recreational vehicles, and boats.

9. Self-help courses in personal finance*, personal income tax preparation, law for the layman, and real estate for the consumer.

10. Self-help personal development courses except for orientation to college, career planning, study skills, and group assessment of academic preparation, aptitudes, and interests.

11. The following physical education courses: bicycling, Far Eastern martial arts; yoga; jazzercise; scuba* and skin diving*; camping, backpacking, rockclimbing, mountaineering, and orienteering; ballroom, belly, square, ethnic*, tap, and disco dancing; roller and ice skating; flycasting, rafting; soaring and gliding; surfing and windsurfing; recreational sailing; water ballet; and horsemanship. ADDED: jogging, figure and weight control, archery, badminton.

12. The following fine arts courses: jewelry* and lapidary; Crafts*; stained glass; calligraphy*; tole painting; enameling; intaglio*; avocational or recreational instrumental study; and performance or gallery attendance courses in art, music, drama, or cinema without significant classroom work or academic content.

13. International study/travel courses.

14. Avocational photography.

15. Courses related to specific avocations such as stamp or coin collecting.

16. Genealogy.

17. Real estate courses except those courses designed to lead to the sales license.

*Courses marked with an asterisk may continue to be offered if they are a required part of an approved educational program and after approval of petition by Chancellor's Office.

COURSES TO BE DELETED FROM THE NONCREDIT PROGRAM

1. Lecture and forum series except those designed specifically for older adults.

2. Re-licensure courses.

This final list incorporates several changes made by the Board to the staff prepared list shown in Appendix C. Physical education courses were added in jogging, figure and weight control, archery, and badminton. Relicensure courses were dropped from the deletion list. All of the changes made at the Board meeting to the staff list are shown in Appendix D.

Calculating the Deductions

Upon receipt of the lists of deleted courses from the colleges the returns were tabulated and the dollar deduction was calculated for each college and for the state as a whole. Preliminary staff estimates based upon a random stratified sample of colleges were that the $30 million could be obtained through the deleted courses. As the display indicates, staff projections were not far off the mark. The total statewide deduction is $29,220,131. Because staff has not had sufficient time to check each college's list of deleted courses for accuracy, it is estimated that further analysis of the returns will increase the statewide deduction to the required $30 million. Table 1 displays the preliminary estimated dollar amounts of the deductions from the credit program and the non-credit program for each college, and the statewide totals. The column on the extreme right indicates the percentage the deduction is of total revenue for each college. The statewide average loss in revenue as a result of the course deletion is 2.04 percent. The range of those percentages is from 0.59 percent to 6.03 percent. As has been pointed out previously, the size of a college's deduction is dependent on the number of the deleted courses which were offered during 1981-82.

TABLE 1

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
ESTIMATED REDUCTIONS TO 1982-83 BASE REVENUE
PURSUANT TO PROVISION 11 OF ITEM 6870-101-001
BUDGET ACT OF 1982

District	Deduction from Credit Program	Deduction from Noncredit Program	Total Deduction	Percent Deduction is of Total Revenue
ALLAN HANCOCK	144,347	19,800	184,147	1.35
ANTELOPE VALLEY	55,344	0	55,344	0.87
BARSTOW	25,920	0	25,920	0.84
BUTTE	471,713	4,400	476,113	4.23
CABRILLO	255,126	0	255,126	2.05
CERRITOS	472,000	0	472,000	2.02
CHAFFEY	224,949	0	224,949	1.42
CITRUS	156,283	16,500	172,783	1.67
COACHELLA VALLEY	206,849	17,800	224,449	2.49
COAST	3,808,201	167,200	3,975,401	6.03
COMPTON	206,500	0	206,500	2.66
CONTRA COSTA	635,401	0	635,401	1.65
EL CAMINO	583,854	0	583,854	2.01
FOOTHILL	817,965	0	817,965	1.94
FREMONT NEWARK	136,782	0	136,782	1.47
GAVILAN	28,512	0	28,512	0.59
GLENDALE	244,860	0	244,860	1.91
GROSSMONT	521,778	234,300	756,078	3.63
HARTNELL	122,757	0	122,757	1.24
IMPERIAL	164,592	0	164,592	2.67
KERN	336,950	0	336,950	1.45
LAKE TAHOE	36,288	0	36,288	2.18
LASSEN	107,588	0	107,588	2.46
LONG BEACH	851,715	0	851,715	3.01
LOS ANGELES	2,453,968	0	2,453,968	1.52
LOS RIOS	392,730	0	392,730	0.78
MARIN	129,105	8,800	137,905	0.90
MENDOCINO	93,312	0	93,612	2.55
MERCED	243,295	0	243,295	2.31
MIRA COSTA	231,231	0	231,231	2.18
MONTEREY PENINSULA	278,817	0	278,817	2.91
MT. SAN ANTONIO	363,456	34,100	397,556	1.44
MT. SAN JACINTO	75,188	0	75,168	1.91
NAPA	74,115	9,900	84,015	0.97
NORTH ORANGE	897,668	0	497,668	1.88
PALOMAR	366,744	0	366,744	1.87
PALO VERDE	7,776	1,100	8,876	9.93
PASADENA	431,697	0	431,697	1.55
PERALTA	1,490,784	0	1,490,784	5.89
RANCHO SANTIAGO	607,131	0	607,131	2.12
REDWOODS	322,490	0	322,490	3.20
RIO HONDO	181,008	0	181,008	1.31
RIVERSIDE	380,835	23,100	403,939	2.85
SADDLEBACK	854,284	0	854,284	2.82

11

TABLE 1
(continued)

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
ESTIMATED REDUCTIONS TO 1982-83 BASE REVENUE
PURSUANT TO PROVISION 11 OF ITEM 6870-101-001
BUDGET ACT OF 1982

District	Deduction from Credit Program	Deduction from Noncredit Program	Total Deduction	Percent Deduction is of Total Revenue
SAN BERNARDINO	458,528	0	458,528	2.14
SAN DIEGO	617,695	0	617,695	1.05
SAN FRANCISCO	380,697	66,000	446,897	0.83
SAN JOAQUIN	464,277	0	464,277	2.34
SAN JOSE	264,670	0	264,670	1.22
SAN LUIS OBISPO	103,885	0	103,885	1.41
SAN MATEO	811,760	0	811,760	2.34
SANTA BARBARA	180,804	0	180,804	1.20
SANTA CLARITA	46,656	0	46,656	1.03
SANTA MONICA	300,820	0	300,820	1.59
SEQUOIAS	254,034	0	254,034	2.53
SHASTA-TE-TR	374,199	0	374,199	3.46
SIERRA	223,242	0	223,242	1.98
SISKIYOU	42,768	0	42,768	1.37
SOLANO	177,459	0	177,459	1.82
SONOMA	494,979	0	494,979	2.21
SOUTH COUNTY	329,525	18,700	348,225	1.69
STATE CENTER	312,315	0	312,515	1.33
SWEETWATER	347,316	9,900	357,216	2.62
VENTURA	628,500	0	828,500	1.93
VICTOR VALLEY	46,656	17,600	64,258	1.16
WEST HILLS	112,752	2,200	114,952	2.57
WEST KERN	123,120	0	123,120	4.40
WEST VALLEY	486,552	0	486,552	2.01
YOSEMITE	317,800	4,400	322,200	1.53
YUBA	171,654	0	171,654	1.36
STATE TOTAL	28,564,531	655,600	29,220,131	2.04

Of the total statewide savings, preliminary analysis indicates that approximately 53 percent has been made in the subject matter areas of physical education and fine arts. Further, more detailed analyses of district-by-district and course reductions will be undertaken as the year progresses.

If, after checking each college's list of deleted courses, it is found that the required $30 million has not been obtained, alternative methods for an additional deduction will be explored. One such method would be to determine which colleges have a larger percentage than the state average of their total workload in physical education and the fine arts. Those colleges, when identified, would be asked to make an additional deduction in their ADA and apportionments. However, it is our expectation that alternative strategies will not be necessary and that careful review of data submitted to us by the colleges will generate the necessary additional reductions.

Difficulties Encountered in Implementation

Few Marginal Courses

The major difficulty encountered was the identification of a sufficient number of clearly recreational, avocational, or self-development courses to produce the required savings. For the past several years, many of the community colleges had begun the process of removing such courses from their credit programs. This movement was stimulated and accelerated by the ADA growth limitation placed upon community colleges by several recent funding bills. In the face of growing enrollments, colleges attempted to reserve space in their programs for the traditional liberal arts and sciences and vocational courses by deleting the more marginal courses. Also, in spite of the perceptions of some journalists and government decision-makers, such courses were never a significant portion of the total community college offerings. It is estimated that less than one percent of total statewide community college apportionment was earned in such classes, but the $30 million reduction equaled between two and three percent of apportionments.

The Legislative language referring to "avocational, recreational, and personal development" clearly represents an attempt to make reductions on the basis of student intent. But determining student intent is not an easy process. There is ample evidence to demonstrate that a course become recreational, avocational, or self-development when a student chooses to make it such. Many students find recreation and avocational interests in courses such as history, geology, geography, and even calculus--not only lapidary, jogging, and cooking. It follows that identifying specific courses as avocational, recreational and self-development is an unreliable way to target student intent.

Therefore, concepts were explored by the staff of the Chancellor's Office to include some other measure of student intent in the required reduction. One concept was to designate all off-campus physical education courses as

nonapportionment courses. However, several of the smaller colleges with inadequate physical education facilities and which make extensive use of community and private facilities would have been severely impacted. Another concept was to require students enrolled for fewer than six units to pay fees for courses. Such a plan would have discriminated against many students who are working on a part-time basis on certificates or degrees and would have required special legislation. Another concept which was explored would have required all students who had already taken 75 units of college work to pay fees. That plan would also have required special legislation and would have been very difficult for colleges to enforce because few community colleges require students to present transcripts of completed college work.

These and other concepts will be explored by the Board of Governors as part of its deliberations in developing a contingency plan for students fees.

A Transferability Criterion

A plan to limit the deleted courses to courses which do not transfer to four-year colleges was impractical because it would have resulted in a savings far below the required $30 million. Only a few courses offered by community colleges do not transfer to some four-year college and many of those courses are in the remedial area. As such, the plan would have discriminated against the educationally disadvantaged.

Inclusion of Traditional Courses

Because no sure measure of student intent could be included in the preparation of the deleted course list, and since transferability proved to be an unsound criterion, and since the marginal courses alone would not have produced the required savings, it was necessary to include on the list a large number of courses which have traditionally been offered in colleges and universities, which transfer to the four-year colleges, and which are offered by universities in the other segments of public higher education in California. An anomalous situation has been created in which some courses which can no longer be offered for credit or apportionment in the community colleges continue to be offered at public expense for credit in the University of California and the California State Universities.

The Problem of Course Repetition

A serious problem that has been encountered in the past is that some students taking courses for avocational or recreational purposes have enrolled repeatedly in courses such as tennis, jogging, or painting. Such course repetition may have resulted in unjustifiably high costs to the State. The Board of Governors adopted a standard in its grading policy regulations in January 1982 to prohibit a student's repeating any course for credit except when substandard work has been recorded or under

special extenuating circumstances. Staff is currently proposing to the Board an even more stringent regulation governing when such specially-allowed course repetition will be permitted to generate ADA for State support.

However, these restrictions will not be taken into account as part of the $30 million mandated savings, since they invoke a measure of student intent other than by specifying course titles, and since the district-by-district impact of such a policy change is unknown at this time.

Deletion of Real Estate Courses

An example of a traditional program which was included on the list because of the small number of marginal courses is real estate. As adopted by the Board of Governors, the deletions include "real estate courses except those courses designed to lead to the sales license."

The rationale for including real estate courses on the deletion list was that the community colleges traditionally prepare students for entry level occupations. The entry level in the case of real estate is the sales license. Normally, the course entitled "Real Estate Principles" is the course taken in preparation for writing the examination for the sales license. After obtaining the sales license and entering the field of real estate, some persons seek additional courses to prepare for the broker's license. Since the persons who enroll in those additional courses are usually employed in their field, and since the purpose for taking such courses are upgrading, income enhancement, and personal and professional development, it was felt that such courses should be offered on a fee basis. Although similar arguments could be advanced for the inclusion on the deletion list of courses in law enforcement and fire science, it was felt that because such courses normally do not involve a two-tiered licensing process and they enhance the public safety they should be accorded a higher priority for State funding.

It is important to note that the inclusion of real estate courses on the deletion list will not prevent persons in that field from completing requirements for the broker's license or for additional upgrading of professional development. They will have to pay fees, however. The inclusion of real estate courses on the list of deleted courses produced a saving of approximately three to four million dollars.

Because some proportion of real estate students are specifically seeking an Associate degree or Certificate of Achievement in the field, and deletion of real estate courses from the credit program will make it impossible for them to complete their programs, the Chancellor's Office plans to support special legislation to allow academic credit to be granted for real estate courses that were shifted this year into the community services mode. This would be a one-year measure. It is anticipated that longer-term measures may be proposed as part of the Board of Governor's fee contingency plan, which is scheduled for Board action in December, 1982.

Time Constraints

Reference has been made previously to the severe time constraints imposed upon the Board and the Chancellor's Office by the Legislative mandate to effect a savings of $30 million. The major difficulty was that it was impossible to schedule adequate discussion with various groups from the field who would be most affected by the deletions of courses. Six months would have been a more reasonable amount of time in which to implement the mandate.

Lack of Current Data

Another difficulty closely related to the time constraint was the absence of 1981-82 course activity data which could be used to check the accuracy of college-prepared lists of deleted courses. The data which colleges normally report to the Chancellor's Office concerning all courses offered during the Fall semester of 1981 was due on August 1, 1982. Unfortunately, that data does not contain all of the data elements necessary for the required checking purposes. The missing data elements will be available for the March 1983 report of course activity, but obviously too late for the present purposes. In the absence of 1981-82 course activity data, it was necessary to use the data obtained for the 1980-81 course classification report to project district-by-district impact. That procedure introduced some error into the checking procedure because many colleges, for reasons already mentioned, dropped a number of marginal courses from the credit program during the 1980-81 academic year. In spite of these problems, staff will resolve differences between our 1980-81 lists and the district reported 1981-82 activity to assure equity in treatment among districts.

Effects Upon the Community Colleges

The Mission of the Community Colleges

One of the major distinguishing features of the California Community Colleges has been the flexibility and rapidity with which they could provide tuition-free education to meet emerging local needs, especially to educationally and financially disadvantaged students. In some measure, that flexibility has been reduced by the imposition of the list of courses to be deleted from the credit and noncredit programs. While it is true that many of the deleted courses may be offered as fee-based community services classes, access to those classes will be reduced because many persons will be unwilling or unable to pay the required fee. Unfortunately, the transfer of courses from state support to user fee will most likely bear most heavily on those least able to pay. Thus, although the range of offerings of the colleges should remain substantially the same, in terms of the traditional flexibility of response to local needs, and in terms of access to free public education for educationally and economically disadvantaged students, the mission of the community college will have been affected.

Of the three broad concepts of community college mission -- baccaleureate transfer education, vocational education, and adult general education -- clearly it is the last which the Legislature intended to target as of low public priority. However, because no clear measure of student intent could be developed and because the mandated $30 million fgure was set on the basis of fiscal exigencies rather than conscious educational policy, it was not possible to prevent some incursion into the older, historical missions of community colleges.

On the positive side, transfer of a number of credit and noncredit courses to the community services area will serve to strengthen that area and create a better balance between community services and the credit and noncredit instructional program. A secondary effect will be greater uniformity in how community colleges classify their offerings. In the past some courses have been offered variously as credit courses, non-credit courses, or community services classes. The effect of the course deletion list will be to require that colleges classify educational subject matter in a more uniform manner. The Legislature has expressed some concern about the lack of uniformity in community college offerings.

Faculty Staffing

The deletion of credit and noncredit courses will have a significant effect on faculty staffing in the community colleges. For some full-time instructors whose teaching assignments were in courses which were deleted, other assignments will have to be found. This situation will be especially difficult in the areas of physical education, the fine arts, and home economics. Some instructors may be required to assume partial loads in noncredit courses or in community services classes. In some cases it may be necessary for full-time instructors to teach only a partial load but, because the March 15 date for notification of termination of employment is past, it will be necessary for the college to continue the instructor's full-time salary. The greatest impact will be felt by part-time instructors who do not have tenure rights and who can be terminated if there is no class assignment for them. Other part-time instructors will experience some loss of income if the classes they normally teach have been transferred to the community services area in which pay scales are usually considerably below those in the credit program.

Financial Effects

The community colleges, which have for this year received no growth funds and no cost of living adjustment, will lose revenue in varying amounts depending on the number of courses the individual colleges offered which were included on the deletion list. That amount will vary from less than one percent to almost ten percent of a district's 1981-82 ADA and apportionment. Clearly, any loss in revenue for colleges which are already hard-pressed to survive fiscally is a matter of serious import.

Reference has been made to a reduction in the number of part-time instructors who will be employed during 1982-83 because of the reduction in the credit program. That decrease in the number of part-time employees will result in some salary savings. However, for those colleges operating below the level of the enrollment limitation, the salary savings will not offset the loss of apportionment income which would have been generated had the classes been taught.

Another significant problem is that the removal of state support from certain courses will result in severe dislocations in many colleges and an impact on other, higher priority portions of the college curriculum. Most of the courses on the list are lower cost courses. By removing low cost programs from a district's funding base, colleges are left with substantially reduced financial resources with which to fund higher cost programs such as nursing, dental hygiene, computer technology, machine-intensive vocational programs and other programs with higher than average per student costs. The ability of districts to provide these high cost, high demand programs has often depended upon district ability to cost average, i.e. to use the revenues generated beyond costs in the low cost programs to fund costs which exceed revenues in the high cost programs.

Because the deduction in ADA and apportionment income will be made in the 1982-83 base of the colleges, the financial effects of the course deletion will be felt by the colleges for several years. It is unlikely that the fees charged for community services classes will offset that loss in revenue. Finally, there will be an initial loss of enrollment in those courses moved to the fee-supported community services area. Citizens who are accustomed to free education may have some difficulty in adapting to the new system of fee-supported classes.

Summary

The California Community Colleges were directed by the Legislature to cut $30 million from their apportionments for 1982-83 by removing "avocational, recreational, and personal development" courses from the State-funded category. A list of courses to be deleted from the credit and noncredit program was prepared by Chancellor's Office staff and was approved by the Board of Governors on July 16. Colleges were asked to submit lists of courses dropped from their credit and noncredit programs by July 23. Staff checked each college list against the 1980-81 course lists submitted for the Course Classification System. The total ADA was calculated, and, using the college's decremental rate, the total dollar amount of the deduction from each college's 1982-83 base. The total amount of the estimated savings effected by the implementation of the deletion list is currently $29,200,131.

Staff in the Chancellor's Office is continuing to make minor adjustments to specific college course lists through a petition process and comparisons of our 1980-81 data with their 1981-82 data. It is probable that the full $30 million will be reached through this effort in the course

of the next few weeks. However, if it is not, a secondary procedure will be implemented to achieve the required amount.

The major difficulties encountered in implementing the Legislative mandate were the very short implementation time and the small number of courses which could be identified as strictly avocational, recreational, or self-development. Because of the small number of marginal courses, it was necessary to include on the deletion list many courses traditionally offered by colleges and universities and which are currently offered for credit in the University of California and the California State University.

The most immediately apparent effects on community colleges will likely be aggravation of existing financial difficulties in numerous districts, and substantial numbers of faculty layoffs, especially among part-time faculty.

The process of preparing and applying a list of courses to be defunded inevitably included some inconsistencies and inequities. However, the problems will be addressed in comprehensive planning during the coming months. Because the deletion of selected courses from the credit and noncredit curricula is a short-term measure, the authorization for which expires after June 1983, the Board of Governors and Chancellor have already begun to examine alternatives for the 1983-84 academic year. Administrators, faculty and students will be involved in the process of preparing a student fee contingency plan and a new community college finance proposal. The planning process should establish principles and provide guidance for future changes in the mission and curriculum of the community colleges.

APPENDIX A

55001. Community College Educational Program.

I. Instructional Services

(a) The instructional program of the community college includes courses and activities within the following categories:

(1) Liberal Arts and Sciences Education
- A. Baccalaureate Oriented/Transfer Programs and Courses
- B. Associate Degree Programs and Courses
- C. Developmental Programs and Courses
  1. Compensatory Programs and Courses
  2. Adult Elementary and Secondary Basic Skills
- C. Community Education Programs and Courses
  1. Personal Development and Survival Courses
  2. Parenting ad Family Support Courses
  3. Community and Civic Development Courses
  4. General and Cultural Courses

(2) Occupational Education
- A. Vocational/Technical Transfer Programs and Courses
- B. Vocational/Technical Associate Degree and Certificate Programs and Courses
- C. Continuing Education Vocational/Technical Certificate Programs and Courses

II. Community Services (Non-ADA generating)

(1) Community Services Classes
- A. Avocational Classes
- B. Recreational Classes
- C. Seminars, Lecture Series, Forum Series, Workshops, and Conferences
- D. Professional and Occupational Inservice Classes

(2) Community Services Activities
- A. Civic Center Act Activities
- B. Cultural Activities
- C. Community Development Activities
- D. Recreational Activities

APPENDIX B

TENTATIVE LIST OF COURSES TO BE DELETED
FROM THE CREDIT AND NONCREDIT PROGRAM
(6/25/82)

Credit Courses

1. Private pilot's ground school.
2. Ham radio construction, operation, and licensure.
3. Conversational foreign language courses which are designed for travelers and which have no prerequisites.
4. Self-help home sewing and needlecraft courses (for example, quilting, crocheting, weaving, needlepoint, embroidery).
5. Self-help courses in home gardening, home livestock production, and home maintenance.
6. Self-help courses in personal finance, personal income tax preparation, and law for the layman.
7. Self-help courses in consumer maintenance of automobiles, motorcycle, bicycles, recreational vehicles, and boats.
8. Self-help courses in pet selection, care, and grooming.
9. Specialized cooking courses which are not a required part of an approved educational program.
10. The following physical education courses: Far Eastern martial arts, yoga; scuba and skin diving (unless offered as integral part of a marine science program); camping; backpacking; rock climbing; mountaineering; orienteering; ballroom, belly, square, and disco dancing; roller and ice skating; flycasting; rafting; soaring and gliding; surfacing, windsurfing, and recreational sailing, water ballet; horsemanship.
11. All self-help personal development courses.
12. The following fine arts courses; jewelry, crafts, stained glass, calligraphy, stitchery, tole painting, enameling.

Questionable

1. International travel/study courses.
2. Real Estate.
3. Jogging, bicycling, skiing, figure and weight control.

Noncredit courses to be moved to Community Services

1. All lecture and forum series.
2. All relicensure courses.

APPENDIX C

LIST OF COURSES TO BE DELETED FROM THE CREDIT PROGRAM
(As proposed by staff)

1. One semester or single quarter conversational foreign language courses which have no prerequisite or which are designed for travelers.

2. Private Pilot's Ground School.

3. Ham radio construction, operation, and licensure.

4. Self-help home sewing and needlecraft courses* except one introductory course in clothing construction.

5. Self-help specialized cooking courses* except one introductory course in cultural foods.

6. Self-help courses in home gardening; home livestock production; home and appliance repair and maintenance; antique and furniture repair, refinishing, and upholstering; and woodworking.

7. Self-help courses in pet selection, care and grooming.

8. Self-help courses in consumer maintenance of automobiles, motorcycles, bicycles, recreational vehicles, and boats.

9. Self-help courses in personal finance*, personal income tax preparation, law for the layman, and real estate for the consumer.

10. Self-help personal development courses except for orientation to college, career planning, study skills, and group assessment of academic preparation, aptitudes, and interests.

11. The following physical education courses: bicycling, Far Eastern martial arts; yoga; jazzercise; scuba* and skin diving*; camping, backpacking, rockclimbing, mountaineering, and orienteering; ballroom, belly, square, ethnic, tap, and disco dancing; roller and ice skating; flycasting, rafting; soaring and gliding; surfing and windsurfing; recreational sailing; water ballet; and horsemanship.

12. The following fine arts courses: jewelry* and lapidary; Crafts*; stained glass; calligraphy*; tole painting; enameling; intaglio*; avocational or recreational instrumental study; and performance or gallery attendance courses in art, music, drama, or cinema without significant classroom work or academic content.

13. Relicensure courses.

14. International study/travel courses.

15. Avocational photography.

APPENDIX D

Board Changes to Staff List

LIST ITEM	CHANGE
1.	The word "one" was changed to "single" and "single": was inserted between "or" and "quarter" for purposes of clarification.
2.	An asterisk (*) was added to this item to allow for such courses to be offered according to the conditions listed on page A-2.
4 & 5.	"A single" is substituted for the word "one" in both sentences for purposes of clarification.
11.	The following P.E. courses are added: jogging, figure and weight control, archery, badminton; and an asterisk (*) was added to the word "ethnic" to allow such courses to be offered according to the conditions listed on page A-2.
12.	The word "Crafts" is capitalized (for clarification) and an asterisk (*) added to it, and to the word "intaglio," to allow such courses to be offered according to the conditions listed on page A-2.
(13.	Previously numbered Item 13, "relicensure courses" was dropped from the list.)
17.	The item was modified to read "...courses designed to lead to the sales license" rather than "required" for

APPENDIX E

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE

List of Courses to be Deleted by Category

COLLEGE: _____ CONTACT PERSON: _____

4-Digit T.O.P.	Course Title	* Noncredit	Static Identifier	1981-82 Reported ADA

A-6

-49-

310-21

APPENDIX B

LIST OF COURSES TO BE DELETED FROM THE CREDIT PROGRAM

1. Single semester or single quarter conversational foreign language courses which have no prerequisite or which are designed for travelers.

2. Private Pilot's Ground School*.

3. Ham radio construction, operation, and licensure.

4. Self-help home sewing and needlecraft courses* except a single introductory course in clothing construction.

5. Self-help specialized cooking courses* except a single introductory course in cultural foods.

6. Self-help courses in home gardening; home livestock production; home and appliance repair and maintenance; antique and furniture repair, refinishing, and upholstering; and woodworking.

7. Self-help courses in pet selection, care and grooming.

8. Self-help courses in consumer maintenance of automobiles, motorcycles, bicycles, recreational vehicles, and boats.

9. Self-help courses in personal finance*, personal income tax preparation, law for the layman, and real estate for the consumer.

10. Self-help personal development courses except for orientation to college, career planning, study skills, and group assessment of academic preparation, aptitudes, and interests.

11. The following physical education courses: bicycling, Far Eastern martial arts; yoga; jazzercise; scuba* and skin diving*; camping, backpacking, rockclimbing, mountaineering, and orienteering; ballroom, belly, square, ethnic*, tap, and disco dancing; roller and ice skating; flycasting, rafting; soaring and gliding; surfing and windsurfing; recreational sailing; water ballet; and horsemanship. ADDED: jogging, figure and weight control, archery, and badminton.

12. The following fine arts courses: jewelry* and lapidary; Crafts*; stained glass; calligraphy*; tole painting; enameling; intaglio*; avocational or recreational instrumental study; and performance or gallery attendance courses in art, music, drama, or cinema without significant classroom work or academic content.

13. International study/travel courses.

14. Avocational photography.

15. Courses related to specific avocations such as stamp or coin collecting.

16. Genealogy.

17. Real estate courses except those courses designed to lead to the sales license.

*Courses marked with an asterisk may continue to be offered if they are a required part of an approved educational program and after approval of petition by Chancellor's Office.

COURSES TO BE DELETED FROM THE NONCREDIT PROGRAM

1. Lecture and forum series except those designed specifically for older adults.

2. Re-licensure courses.

REFERENCES

Board of Governors, California Community Colleges. Courses To Be Deleted From the Credit and Noncredit Program of the Community Colleges. Agenda Item 5, July 15-16, 1982 Meeting.

California Postsecondary Education Commission. Implementation of the California Community Colleges Course Classification System. Commission Report 82-14. Sacramento: The Commission, April 1982a.

--. Student Charges, Student Financial Aid, and Access to Postsecondary Education: A Report to the Governor and the Legislature in Response to Assembly Concurrent Resolution 81. Commission Report 82-15. Sacramento: The Commission, April 1982b.

Program Evaluation and Approval Unit, Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges. Report to the Legislature: The Deletion of Selected Credit and Noncredit Courses from the California Community College Curriculum. Sacramento: Chancellor's Ofice, 1982 (reproduced in Appendix A of the present report).

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC® CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
8118 MATH-SCIENCES BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
JC 38

APR 8 1983